

American NEWS & VIEWS

A Daily Newsletter from Public Affairs, American Embassy

October 1, 2004

Transcript: Secretary Powell, Jordan's Muasher Discuss Security, Elections in Iraq	1
Transcript: Secretary Powell, China's Li Zhaoxing Discuss North Korea, Taiwan, Sudan	3
Text: USTDA Supports Creation of Airport Security Plan for Thai Airways.....	6
Excerpt: U.S. Calls for Global Supply Chain Security Framework.....	6
Text: Debt Relief for Poor Nations a U.S. Priority, Treasury's Snow Says.....	10
Text: U.S. Refugee Resettlement Policies Need Reform, Report Finds.....	13
Text: 2006 U.S. Visa Lottery Opens in November	19

*EPF402 09/30/2004

Transcript: Secretary Powell, Jordan's Muasher Discuss Security, Elections in Iraq

(Talks also touch on Broader Middle East, North Africa program)

Efforts to stabilize the security situation in Iraq in advance of Iraqi national elections, scheduled for January 2005, topped the agenda as Secretary of State Colin Powell and Jordanian Foreign Minister Marwan Muasher met in Washington September 29.

During a press briefing following their meeting, Powell thanked Muasher and Jordan's King Abdullah for the attention and resources Jordan has contributed to the Iraqi security situation. "Let us not lose sight of the fact that what is important is that the Iraqi people be given the opportunity to vote for who their leaders will be, how they will be governed, the nature of their constitution," he added.

Foreign Minister Muasher expressed Jordan's strong support for the Iraqi Interim Government's efforts to move forward with elections, but added, "We hope these elections will be held all over Iraq so that every Iraqi can participate in the future making of their country."

In a September 28 interview with France's Le Figaro newspaper, Jordan's King Abdullah raised concerns about the possibility of achieving universal suffrage without a marked improvement in the security situation and about the potentially negative repercussions of a partial election.

Muasher told journalists, however, that there is no difference between the U.S. and Jordanian governments on the subject of Iraqi elections.

"We both agree that security is very important and we're both working with the Iraqi Interim Government to be able to help them provide that security. We both agree that elections should be held all over Iraq so that every Iraqi can participate in the election process. And we expressed our hope that the elections will be held on time and that the conditions would be conducive for that," he said.

Powell also thanked Muasher for the leadership role Jordan has played in preparing the groundwork for the Broader Middle East and North Africa Initiative put forth by the Group of Eight countries at their Sea Island, Georgia, summit in June. The program, aimed at supporting political and economic reform initiatives from within the region, took its first major step forward as foreign ministers from 28 countries gathered in New York on September 24 in the inaugural session of the Forum for the Future.

The Forum for the Future will provide ongoing contact between the countries of the region and the G8 on the governmental, private sector and nongovernmental organization levels. G8 countries include Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, the United States and Russia.

Muasher also raised Jordan's concerns about the "great difficulties" confronting the Israeli-Palestinian peace process and reaffirmed his country's commitment to the Roadmap and the objective of a two-state solution, which he characterized as "the only acceptable outcome of the peace process."

Following is the transcript of Powell and Muasher's press availability:

SECRETARY POWELL: (In progress) -- Foreign Minister Muasher here at the State Department. We had a good conversation. I thanked the Minister and, through him, His Majesty and the people of Jordan for the strong support they have steadfastly provided to us in the campaign against terrorism and especially the assistance they have been providing to the people of Iraq as the people of Iraq prepare for elections that expect to be held by the end of January, 2005.

As His Majesty, King Abdullah, mentioned the other day, the security situation is a challenge. We understand this and our commanders are hard at work, as well as our political authorities, hard at work with the Iraqi Interim Government to bring the security situation under control and to defeat this insurgency, especially insurgency raging within the Sunni triangle.

But let us not lose sight of the fact that what is important is that the Iraqi people be given the opportunity to vote for who their leaders will be, how they will be governed, the nature of their constitution. And it is the obligation of the international community to help the Iraqi people achieve freedom and stability so that they can become a nation of stability in the region, and I thank Jordan for the assistance that it has been providing.

I also thanked the Minister for the contribution he made to the conference that we had last Friday morning at the UN in New York. It was really a preliminary conference, the beginning of the process called the Forum for the Future that came out of the G-8 meeting at Sea Island earlier in the year, where the broader Middle East and North African nations come together with the G-8 to talk about modernization and reform within the region; reform and modernization, as determined by the nations of the region,

but with the assistance and help and with the partnership of the industrialized world.

It was an excellent opening conference. Twenty-eight nations came together and talked candidly -- not just rhetorically, but candidly and with substance -- about the challenges that we were all facing together, and how we can work with each other in partnership and in friendship to support reform efforts that are coming from within the region. And I would especially like to thank my friend Marwan for the leadership he has played within the Middle East in bringing this to the attention of all of the nations of the Middle East and helping bring a statement forward out of the Arab League that endorses this kind of reform and modernization effort.

Our bilateral relationship, as always, is very solid and strong and Marwan, it's a great pleasure to have you here and I invite you say a word or two.

FOREIGN MINISTER MUASHER: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. It's always an honor, a pleasure to be here. Indeed, as the Secretary said, we had a very good discussion over a range of issues, from Iraq to the peace process to the very central issue of reform, which we have in our region. Last week in New York, we indeed had the chance not only to take stock of what has already been achieved in the region, but also to start planning ahead of the next steps we need to take in that regard. We had a very healthy dialogue with members of the G-8, and I think that the process is starting to get traction and hopefully will lead to further progress as we go along in the future. We expressed our strong support for the Iraqi Interim Government in its efforts to hold elections and move the political process forward. We hope these elections will be held all over Iraq so that every Iraqi can participate in the future making of their country. We also had a chance to talk about the peace process undergoing certainly great difficulties, but I indicated again our support for the roadmap and for the need to maintain our objective of a two-state solution as the only acceptable outcome of the peace process, and we discussed ways in which we can work together to move the process forward.

Mr. Secretary, again, thank you for receiving me.

SECRETARY POWELL: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, can I ask you for your views of an Iraq conference which the Iraqi Foreign Minister would like held? The French say, put on the agenda the withdrawal of U.S. troops. I wonder if you think that's a terrific idea. And, you know, do you think generally that it is a good idea to have this conference?

I'm going to do a two-fer, which I never do, but Mr. Minister, on elections, your government appears to stress security; the U.S. is stressing the need to have the Iraqi people choose a government. Is there a difference between your two positions?

SECRETARY POWELL: On the first point, the conference that the Iraqi Interim Government wants to hold is something that we strongly support, and it's an idea that Prime Minister Allawi has been discussing with his neighbors and with us for some period of time.

It got a lot of attention last week in New York because I made reference to it on several occasions. It would be a conference held in the region with all of Iraq's neighbors, the G-8, and representatives of the Arab League, and Organization of the Islamic Conference and perhaps some others.

Dates are being examined now. Prime Minister Allawi and Foreign Minister Zabari are out working this right now, and so I hope this conference will be held in the not-too-distant future, but the specific date, I'll wait for the Iraqi Interim Government to announce after arrangements have been made, and I look forward to personally participating in the conference.

I think what Foreign Minister Barnier, the French Foreign Minister was suggesting the other day was that such a conference might look at the resolution that was passed by the UN that talked about what happens after a year and after the next election, with respect to the mandate of the multinational force. And the French Embassy and the French Ministry have clarified that the Minister was in no way suggesting a precondition for their attendance at the conference, nor was he suggesting specific agenda items. He was merely noting that the resolution itself calls for a review of this matter after the elections are held next year, and if that's an item that the participants wish to put on the agenda, that would be perfectly appropriate and I see nothing wrong with that.

And so I'm afraid that the Minister's comments were somewhat misinterpreted by the press; at least, that's what the Ministry of Foreign Affairs believes as well.

FOREIGN MINISTER MUASHER: Barry, let me stress that there is no difference whatsoever between our position and that of the U.S. Administration. We both agree that security is very important and we're both working with the Iraqi Interim Government to be able to help them provide that security. We both agree that elections should be held all over Iraq so that every Iraqi can participate in the election process. And we expressed our hope that the elections will

be held on time and that the conditions would be conducive for that.

QUESTION: Can you tell us, Mr. Secretary, what you know about Italy's efforts to free those two hostages who arrived in Rome last night? And there has been a lot of talk about ransom. I wanted to ask you, are you concerned that a steadfast ally like Italy might have negotiated with terrorist and paid -- or someone connected to them paid -- a ransom of as much as \$1 million?

SECRETARY POWELL: I have no information concerning their release, and I would suggest that you ask the Italian Government. I have no information with respect to the release, and I will take my lead from whatever the Italian Government says about the matter.

Thank you.

*EPF403 09/30/2004

Transcript: Secretary Powell, China's Li Zhaoxing Discuss North Korea, Taiwan, Sudan

(Secretary says U.S. prepared to reschedule talks when North Korea ready)

Secretary of State Colin L. Powell met with Chinese Foreign Minister Li Zhaoxing in Washington on September 30, the fourth such meeting between the two officials so far this year.

In remarks to reporters after the meeting, Powell said he and Li had a "full discussion" of issues, including the status of negotiations on the North Korean nuclear program, U.S. policy toward Taiwan, the situation in the Darfur region of Sudan, and trade.

"As partners, as friends, we can talk to each other candidly," Powell said. "We can build on those areas where we have solid agreement. And when we do have areas of disagreement, we speak about them candidly in the spirit of friendship."

Powell acknowledged that a new round of six-party negotiations on North Korea's nuclear program had stalled when talks originally scheduled for September did not take place, but said all sides remain "solidly behind" the process. The parties involved are the United States, China, Japan, South Korea, North Korea, and Russia.

"I know that China and the United States have a common view that the six-party talks are the way to move forward to resolve the issue of nuclear weapons on the Korean

Peninsula," Powell said, "and I know that our Russian, South Korean, and Japanese friends feel the same way."

The secretary emphasized that the United States is prepared to reschedule the talks and renew engagement when the North Koreans are ready. "They have, in recent weeks, indicated that they are still committed to the six-party talks," he said.

Foreign Minister Li agreed that the six-party talks are "the only feasible and correct option" to resolve the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula. However, he said, "complicating factors and new difficulties" had emerged in planning for the next round of talks.

"Actually, this has required all of us to continue to adopt a more patient and more creative approach in finding a solution," Li said.

Noting that the Taiwan issue is "of uppermost concern to our Chinese friends," Powell stressed that the United States supports a resolution of the issue that is mutually acceptable to both sides. He reiterated the "One China" policy based on the three joint communiqués between the United States and China and U.S. obligations under the Taiwan Relations Act.

"We strongly support our One China policy, which has stood the test of time," he said. "It has benefited the people in Taiwan, benefited people in the mainland, and benefited the international community and certainly benefited the United States. So our policy remains unchanged."

The secretary said the two sides had "a good conversation" on arms sales to Taiwan.

"[China's] positions are well known," he said. "As I said to the minister, our obligations under our domestic law with respect to the Taiwan Relations Act, in our judgment, are not, in any way, inconsistent with our One China policy."

Without specifically naming the United States, Li said China is "firmly opposed to the sales of weapons by any foreign country to Taiwan."

But Powell pointed out that the United States determines what is sold to Taiwan "on the basis of what they need for their self-defense."

"I think our policy has served both nations, the United States and China, very, very well, and Taiwan very, very, well, over the course of a number of years," Powell said.

Following is a transcript of the joint press briefing, as provided by the Department of State:

SECRETARY POWELL: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. It's my great pleasure to have my colleague and friend Foreign Minister Li here. This is the fourth time we have met so far this year, and we're only nine months into the year.

As always, we had a full discussion of bilateral issues. We talked about trade. We talked about the six-party talks that China has been hosting and has been such a leader in. And we expressed our hope that we would be able to move forward with the next round of six-party talks in the not-too-distant future, and we hope that the North Koreans will show more flexibility with respect to setting a date.

We talked about the situation in the Darfur region of Sudan. We talked about the strength of our relationship, and we took note of the fact that as partners, as friends, we can talk to each other candidly. We can build on those areas where we have solid agreement. And when we do have areas of disagreement, we speak about them candidly in the spirit of friendship.

As always, we talked about the Taiwan issue, which is of uppermost concern to our Chinese friends, and I once again reaffirmed our One China policy and the strength of the three communiqués and also noted our obligations under the Taiwan Relations Act and reaffirmed what President Bush has said a number of times, that we do not support any movement toward independence on the part of Taiwan.

So, Mr. Minister, it's a pleasure to have you here, and I invite you to say a word.

FOREIGN MINISTER LI: Thank you very much. (Via interpreter.) I'm very pleased to come back to Washington again. Actually, this is like coming home, coming back home, because I have so many friends here. Actually, the Secretary and I have just traded praises for each other, because in the first nine months of this year, we have had four meetings and 15 phone conversations. So if there is a sport item in the world which is called "the phone calls between foreign ministers," then perhaps we will get the gold medal.

We would like to continue our efforts to further develop the constructive and cooperative relations between our two countries on the basis of the principles enshrined in the three Sino-U.S. Joint Communiqués for the benefits of our two peoples and the world peace and common development. Thank you.

SECRETARY POWELL: Thank you.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, could you talk to us about any new initiatives for resolving the Korea impasse that you may have had with Minister Li?

SECRETARY POWELL: Oh, I don't have any Korea impasse with Minister Li. We are all solidly behind the six-party talks. We had an agreement at one point that we would have the next round of talks this month. That obviously isn't going to take place. I know that China and the United States have a common view that the six-party talks are the way to move forward to resolve the issue of nuclear weapons on the Korean Peninsula, and I know that our Russian, South Korean and Japanese friends feel the same way.

And so, we stand ready to engage with North Korea when they decide that they are ready to have another round of discussions. They have, in recent weeks, indicated that they are still committed to the six-party talks and we'll just have to wait and see when they can be rescheduled.

QUESTION: Secretary Powell, on Yaser Hamdi, what's the status of talks with the Saudis, and why do they seem reluctant to take custody of him?

SECRETARY POWELL: I can't answer that. There are conversations that are taking place between our immigration and other authorities and the Saudis, and I am not in a position to explain the Saudi position to you right now, but we're working it. I think we'll eventually get our - work our way through it.

QUESTION: U.S. officials have said the ultimate settlement of Taiwan issue has to be acceptable to the people in Taiwan. But could it -- should it also be acceptable to the people in mainland China, or are you going to just ignore the voice and desire of a billion plus people?

SECRETARY POWELL: Of course not. It has to be acceptable to both sides. That's what reconciliation is all about and we strongly support our One China policy, which has stood the test of time. It has benefited the people in Taiwan, benefited people in the mainland, and benefited the international community and certainly benefited the United States. So our policy remains unchanged. One China policy is well known to all, the three communiqués upon which it rests, our obligations under the Taiwan Relations Act. And there is no support in the United States for an independence movement in Taiwan because that would be inconsistent with our obligations and our commitment to our One China policy.

QUESTION: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. If the North Korea eventually does not come to the six-party talks, is the United States Government prepared to bring the matter to the U.N. Security Council?

SECRETARY POWELL: Well, I think it's premature to discuss what might happen if the six-party framework doesn't work. I think it will work. I think that the six-party framework is what we should be concentrating on and not any other means of dealing with this right now, and I'm quite confident that the six-party framework is a framework in which this matter will be dealt with for the foreseeable future because it serves the interests of all parties. All of North Korea's neighbors are involved in this. They have as much of an interest and an even greater equity in seeing a denuclearized Peninsula than does the United States.

And so all of us together, working together, should be able to resolve this problem. We put forward -- the United States put forward, along with our friends, I believe, a fair, equitable way forward at the last round of discussions; and we are studying the positions that the North Koreans put forward. We hope they're studying our position very, very carefully.

The President has made it clear that we have no intention of invading or attacking North Korea, no hostile intent. And the other members of the six-party team have suggested that security assurances can be provided in due course. So there's a way forward. And we ought to concentrate on the six-party talks because I think they ultimately will be successful and not alternatives to the six-party talks.

SECRETARY POWELL: I'm still looking at my schedule for the rest of the year. I always look forward to visiting China, and there are always issues that are before us that we can discuss with my colleague, Foreign Minister Li, or with the Chinese leadership as a way of cementing the relationship, and more than just cementing it, but building the relationship. And so I'm looking at my calendar now and hope I will be able to visit China in the not too distant future.

QUESTION: Thank you. U.S. and Taiwan is discussing about arms sale, and this topic, has this topic come up on the meeting? And can I also ask the position of Foreign Minister, Chinese Foreign Minister on this regard?

FOREIGN MINISTER LI: (Via interpreter.) First of all, I would like to tell all of you that tomorrow would be the 55th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China.

Today, I would like to convey through you to all the overseas Chinese students and all Chinese citizens in the U.S. my best greetings on the national day of China.

With regard to the Taiwan question, I would like to say here that the Chinese Government and the people attach great importance to the reaffirmations made by the U.S. President, the Secretary and U.S. Government on many occasions of the U.S.'s continued adherence to the One China Policy, the observance of the three Sino-U.S. Joint Communiqués and the opposition to Taiwan independence.

At the same time, I wish to point out that in any country, its domestic law should not go above its international commitments. The Chinese Government and Chinese people are ready to use our maximum sincerity and make our best efforts to realize a peaceful reunification of the country and find a peaceful solution to the Taiwan question. However, we will never, ever allow anyone to use any means to separate Taiwan, which is an inalienable part of the Chinese territory, from the rest of our great motherland.

Therefore, we are firmly opposed to the sales of weapons by any foreign country to Taiwan, which is a part of China, because we don't think it is in the interest of our peaceful efforts towards the resolution of the Taiwan question and it does not serve the interest of peace and stability across the Taiwan Straits and eventually it will not serve the interest of those countries who are prepared to sell weapons to Taiwan.

With regards to the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula, I would like to add, in addition to what the Secretary has said, actually, now all the parties who attend the Beijing six-party talks and, actually, the entire international community, have expressed the views that the resolution of the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula through the six-party talks is the only feasible and correct option.

Now concerning the issue of the next round of six-party talks, there have emerged some new complicating factors and new difficulties. Actually, this has required all of us to continue to adopt a more patient and more creative approach in finding a solution through peaceful means to the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula through the framework of the six-party talks because nothing is more precious than peace.

SECRETARY POWELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Minister, we had a good --

QUESTION: Last question, Mr. Secretary --

SECRETARY POWELL: We had a good conversation on Taiwan arms sales. Their positions are well known. As I said to the Minister, our obligations under our domestic law with respect to the Taiwan Relations Act, in our judgment, are not, in any way, inconsistent with our One China policy and our obligations under that One China policy and the three communiqués.

We always measure what is sold to Taiwan on the basis of what they need for their self-defense, and I think our policy has served both nations, the United States and China, very, very well, and Taiwan very, very well, over the course of a number of years.

Thank you very much.

*EPF404 09/30/2004

Text: USTDA Supports Creation of Airport Security Plan for Thai Airways

(Grant reflects U.S., APEC commitment to regional security)

The U.S. Trade and Development Agency (USTDA) has provided a \$530,000 grant to develop a threat assessment and security implementation plan for Thai Airways, Thailand's national carrier, the USTDA said in a press release issued September 23.

"The USTDA grant awarded today reflects the U.S. Government's overall commitment to the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum's objective of advancing regional economic growth, prosperity and security," the release says.

Following is the text of the press release:

USTDA SUPPORTS SECURITY PROGRAM FOR THAI AIRWAYS FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

BANGKOK, THAILAND (September 23, 2004) - Earlier today, the U.S. Trade and Development Agency (USTDA) provided a \$530,000 grant to Thai Airways International Public Company Limited (THAI). The grant will be used to develop a threat assessment and security implementation plan for THAI's operations at the new Bangkok Suvarnabhumi Airport, which is scheduled to open in September 2005. The grant was conferred in a signing ceremony held at THAI's Head Office in Bangkok. United States Ambassador to Thailand Darryl N. Johnson and Mr. Kanok Abhiradee, President, signed the grant agreement on behalf of the U.S. Government and THAI, respectively.

As Thailand's national carrier, THAI will be the largest tenant of the new airport and a key provider of aviation-related services to other airlines using the airport's facilities. The USTDA-funded implementation plan will identify resources and define security policies that will help THAI meet international security standards and ensure the safety of its operations. The assistance will also highlight the latest technologies and practices that can prevent the impact of terrorism on lives, assets and business reputation.

The USTDA grant awarded today reflects the U.S. Government's overall commitment to the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum's objective of advancing regional economic growth, prosperity and security. In particular, the technical assistance supports the Secure Trade in the APEC Region (STAR) Initiative, which seeks to accelerate efforts to screen people and cargo before transit, increase security on ships and airplanes while en route, secure private company supply chains, and enhance security in airports and seaports. In addition, the technical assistance will advance the goals of the Asian Development Bank's Regional Trade and Financial Security Initiative (RTFSI), which was established by APEC Leaders to strengthen anti-money laundering efforts, combat the financing of terrorism, and enhance port security in the APEC Region.

The U.S. Trade and Development Agency advances economic development and U.S. commercial interests in developing and middle-income countries. The agency funds various forms of technical assistance, feasibility studies, training, orientation visits and business workshops that support the development of a modern infrastructure and a fair and open trading environment. USTDA's strategic use of foreign assistance funds to support sound investment policy and decision-making in host countries creates an enabling environment for trade, investment and sustainable economic development. In carrying out its mission, USTDA gives emphasis to economic sectors that may benefit from U.S. exports of goods and services.

*EPF406 09/30/2004

Excerpt: U.S. Calls for Global Supply Chain Security Framework

(Envisions central role for customs in protecting trade from terrorists)

The United States is calling for an international security and trade facilitation framework that would help secure global

supply chains against terrorist manipulation without impeding trade flows.

In September 21 remarks to the Customs World Summit in London, Customs and Border Protection Commissioner Robert Bonner said that all nations would benefit from adhering to universal standards governing customs-to-customs and customs-to-business relationships.

All countries have a stake in protecting global trade because a terrorist attack in a country involved in such trade would send economic ripples throughout the entire international trade system, Bonner said.

He said that the U.S.-proposed approach would ensure a uniform and predictable regulatory environment for companies doing business globally.

Bonner said that features of the four key elements of the U.S. strategy -- the 24-hour rule, the Container Security Initiative (CSI), the Customs and Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT) and automated risk targeting -- could form the basis of an international framework.

The 24-hour rule requires advance submission of electronic information on all U.S.-destined cargo 24 hours before the cargo is loaded at a foreign seaport.

Under CSI, the Customs and Border Protection (CBP) agency in the Department of Homeland Security places its inspectors at foreign ports to identify high-risk, U.S.-bound cargo containers for physical inspection by their local counterparts.

C-TPAT is a program that asks U.S. importers to secure their global supply chains in return for faster processing of their shipments at U.S. borders and other forms of preferential treatment.

Bonner said that the core mission of customs authorities around the world can be expanded to include securing trade against terrorist threats and that the World Customs Organization (WCO) should lead the effort to develop and implement an international framework. But he acknowledged that the broadening of customs authority may require legislative changes in some countries.

Bonner said he hopes that a high level group WCO group established in June to draft global standards will present its recommendations in December.

Because not all developing countries will be able to participate in the proposed framework, developed countries must be prepared to help build capacity in those

nations that are "truly" committed to the implementation of international standards, he said.

Following is an excerpt from Bonner's remarks as prepared for delivery:

Department of Homeland Security

Customs and Border Protection

Remarks by Robert C. Bonner, Customs World London Summit 2004
London, England

09/21/2004

Call to Internationalize the Strategy

But, while the U.S. has pioneered a strategy for the security of global trade, collectively all of us must do more to secure what moves into -- and through -- ports of the world, not just into the ports of the United States.

I would like to see the EU [European Union] join with us on the strategy to prevent, not just the U.S. from being hit, but preventing the EU and its member states from being hit, as well.

That's why we are actively discussing with the EU the adoption of the 24-Hour Rule; expanding of CSI to goods being shipped to EU ports; the adoption of a Customs-Trade Partnership program; and the use of automated risk targeting to help identify what is a potential terrorist risk.

The 24-Hour Rule, CSI, C-TPAT, and automated risk targeting are the key elements for a global strategy to secure and facilitate global trade, not just trade from certain European or Asian nations and the United States, important as that security network is -- a network already largely in place.

The strategy we have implemented in partnership with other nations and the private sector secures only a portion of the global supply chain-principally the trade routes to the United States.

To better protect global trade against the threat of global terrorism, we need to promptly make the 24-Hour Rule, CSI, C-TPAT, and automated, risk-based targeting international standards that all nations adhere to.

Such a strategy would be benefit all nations for two reasons:

First, should a terrorist attack occur in the United States or any other country in the trade chain, the economic impact would be potentially devastating and the economic ripples would be felt around the world. All nations have a stake in protecting global trade and the global economy.

Second, securing supply chains assures predictability and uniformity of approach for each participant in the supply chain.

For companies to compete and for nations to have confidence in the security of goods flowing through their ports, a common approach is imperative.

Multinational companies that manufacture, import and export out of dozens of countries everyday cannot afford to put dozens of different systems in place to satisfy dozens of different national requirements and rules.

This approach will probably not secure trade. It most certainly will not facilitate it.

The U.S. strategy and the four interrelated initiatives recognize that security and facilitation are not mutually exclusive.

The U.S. initiatives do both.

The core elements of the U.S. initiatives can be used to form an international Framework of "standards," governing customs-to-customs relationships and customs-to-business relationships.

In my judgment, the Framework would consist of these five elements:

First, all nations joining the international Framework or regime would require advanced manifest information about shipments 24 hours before lading.

The data elements to be provided would be harmonized, so all nations joining in the Framework would require and receive the same data on shipments, preferably electronically.

Second, each country should employ a common risk management approach with regard to the terrorist threat, in the way "high risk" containers are identified, inbound and outbound.

Third, there should be information sharing relevant to terrorist risks between the customs authorities of nations participating in the Framework.

Fourth, at the reasonable request of the receiving nation, based upon a common risk targeting methodology, the sending nation's customs agency would perform an outbound inspection, preferably using detection equipment, such as large-scale x-ray machines and radiation detectors, of high risk containers.

Fifth, each nation participating in the Framework would agree to provide benefits, such as expedited processing, to private sector companies that meet minimal supply chain security standards and best practices.

Some of these measures could be implemented now. For example, most EU member states have CSI agreements with the United States.

The EU and its member states could extend the EU zone of security by three simple actions:

- First, adopting a 24-Hour Rule,
- Second, assessing all such shipments for risk, and
- Third, entering into bilateral-even multilateral agreements-for security inspections of high risk shipments heading for European seaports from, say, Port Said, Karachi, or Singapore.

The EU and its member states, and the U.S. have a working group designed to do this, and it is making great progress.

But, beyond the EU and the U.S.: How can we implement a global strategy to secure and facilitate international trade?

How do we implement this global Framework?

I believe that the World Customs Organization can -- and should -- lead this effort and get it done.

The International Maritime Organization -- IMO -- implemented international standards for the security of seaports throughout the world, minimum standards that took effect in July of this year.

IMO standards may help secure against unauthorized access to ports -- and that's important -- but we must also focus on what moves into -- and through -- these ports.

That's where a WCO endorsed Framework for security and facilitation of global trade comes in.

The WCO has the participation of the customs administrations of 163 countries, representing 99 percent of global trade.

And customs administrations have important authorities that exist nowhere else in government -- the authority to inspect everything, all cargo, all goods, shipped into or exported from a country.

This is also the authority to refuse entry or exit. And the authority, for example, to expedite, or delay entry.

Customs administrations always require information about goods being imported, and often require information about goods exported. They can, with appropriate legislation, require that information be provided in advance and electronically.

These classic "customs" authorities can be used for more than interdicting illegal drugs, assuring trade compliance, and collecting revenues. They can -- and should -- be used to secure trade against terrorists and the terrorist threat.

It is an unacceptable and an unnecessary drag on trade to inspect every shipment. So all advanced customs administrations tend to risk manage for a variety of issues, some like the U.S., use automated systems.

That is why customs can -- and should -- play a central role in the security and facilitation of global trade. As I described in my remarks at the WCO Council last July, this should be the role of Customs in the 21st Century.

But we don't want -- and the international trade community should not be burdened with -- 163 different sets of requirements to secure trade against the threat of terrorism. There should be one set of rules.

And, the WCO has already begun work that could lead to a Framework.

Last June, the WCO has adopted a resolution that established a High Level Group of heads of customs, Directors General, to draft the global Framework I have talked about.

The private sector, who own and know the supply chain, will be consulted before the Framework is adopted.

But, I am hopeful that a draft of the Framework will be presented to the WCO Policy Commission this December.

Time is of the essence. And we do not know how much time we have.

No country would be required to join the WCO Framework or regime for the security of global trade, but if they do join, they will be agreeing to adhere to the Framework.

Goods from a Non-Framework country will undoubtedly be viewed as a higher risk by receiving nations.

That said, the WCO Framework needs to recognize that not all developing countries currently have the capacity to participate in the type of WCO Framework I have outlined.

For a country that signifies an intent to join the Framework, that truly has high-level political will and support to take all steps that are prerequisites, a consortium of developed countries should be prepared to assist with the requisite capacity building.

At a minimum, though, a developing country must first have taken real steps toward making four commitments:

-- One, commit to professionalism and integrity of its customs workforce. It makes no sense to invest in capacity building or training if corruption is endemic.

-- Two, commit to use risk management principles and other measures required for securing and facilitating the movement of trade.

-- Three, commit to provide tangible benefits in the form of expedited processing that is transparent to companies that secure their supply chains.

-- And four, commit to do reasonable export inspections at the request of the receiving country.

If the commitment is there, a consortium of developed countries that have adopted the WCO Framework would work to assist in obtaining detection equipment needed through the World Bank loans or other sources; training in security and risk management; and assistance with automation of customs processes.

But I call for all nations to join together to ensure that the core elements of CSI, C-TPAT, advance information requirements, and risk targeting approach are internationalized.

It is imperative that these security principles are applied throughout the world as soon as possible so that all ports, in all nations are secure from the physical and economic threat of global terrorism.

*EPF407 09/30/2004

**Text: Debt Relief for Poor Nations a U.S. Priority,
Treasury's Snow Says**

(Treasury secretary celebrates healthy global economy on eve of G7 meeting)

The Bush administration is continuing to push for expanded debt relief for poor countries, Treasury Secretary John Snow says.

"Grants and debt relief must be significantly increased -- we are considering more options to do so, including those that would provide up to 100 percent debt relief and grants from the international financial institutions," Snow said September 30 in Washington.

He said that employing both grants and debt relief would give the world's poorest countries a chance to reach international development goals of the U.N. Millennium Declaration without adding to their debt burdens.

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which were agreed to by the United States and 188 other countries in 2000, include eradicating extreme poverty and hunger, achieving universal primary education, promoting gender equality and empowering women, reducing child mortality, and combating HIV/AIDS and other diseases.

Snow said he is working with his Group of Seven (G7) counterparts, other donors, international financial institutions and recipient countries on the best way to solve the debt sustainability problem.

Snow is to chair October 1 meetings of the finance ministers and central bank chiefs of the G7 countries -- the United States, Italy, France, Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom and Canada. The G7 officials are meeting in Washington on the sidelines of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank annual meetings, scheduled to conclude on October 3.

New grant assistance programs introduced by the World Bank, the African Development Bank and the Asian Development Bank have proven to be successful and popular in recipient countries, Snow said.

On another issue, the secretary said that the IMF should establish a new, non-borrowing facility -- a policy-monitoring arrangement -- that would allow the fund to signal its approval of a country's economic policies in the absence of a funded program. Such a mechanism would provide donors and markets with a regular assessment of a

country's policies, and strengthen its own sense of responsibility for growth and stability, he said.

Snow said he hopes the International Monetary Financial Committee -- the IMF's policy-making body -- can reach agreement October 2 to urge the IMF to move quickly to put this mechanism in place.

Snow expressed strong confidence in the health of the global economy, but warned against "complacency" and urged the IMF and World Bank to continue reforms that seek to spur development without adding to poor countries' debt burdens.

He made his remarks during an event marking the 20th anniversary of the Bretton Woods Committee, a non-profit group that aims to increase understanding of international finance and development as well the role of the IMF and World Bank.

The secretary's comments also covered the global fight against terrorist financing, President Bush's commitment to cutting the U.S. budget deficit in half over the next five years, and international efforts to raise reconstruction funds for Afghanistan, Iraq and Haiti.

Following is the text of his speech:

Good morning. I'm delighted to be here with you today to discuss the state of both our national and global economies, and the role that the Bretton Woods Institutions play in the promotion of economic growth and opportunity for people all over the globe.

First, let me say congratulations on the 20th anniversary of the Committee. Your purpose is as relevant today as it was 20 years ago, as the world of finance and economies continues to change and develop. It is critical that the largest and most influential financial institutions stay flexible and keep up with the changing times. Your oversight is valued, your counsel welcomed.

We meet at a time of terrific growth and great promise. The global economy is recording the fastest growth in 30 years. No major economy is in recession or facing high inflation. Talk of "bubbles," "overshooting" or "hard landings" is rarely heard these days.

We can -- and should -- celebrate the fact that, this year, there is no major financial crisis to talk about. Remember that in the 1990s we were preoccupied with such crises.

I believe that the Bretton Woods Institutions deserve great credit for getting us to this point of economic health, and I

am optimistic that the positive track we are on will continue; but this is not the time to be complacent. Wrong policies can derail good times.

More than ever it is important that we all focus on setting goals and striving toward milestones; the current condition of sustained economic growth and relative stability of the global financial system actually presents us with a unique opportunity to do so.

Let's take advantage of the solid foundation we stand on today, and our excellent track record of international cooperation, to come to consensus.

If our policies encourage growth through free market flows, with an emphasis on use of private capital, we can not only grow emerging economies, we can make financial markets all over the globe more resilient, more able to recover from future crises.

A terrific recent example of the implementation of a good policy has been the advent of collective action clauses as the market standard in sovereign external bond issues, which have begun to reduce uncertainty and attract investors to the emerging market asset class.

President Bush has led a re-thinking that focuses on results and milestones, on giving incentives and rewards for the kind of economic policies that will benefit generations to come in any country. He emphasized these points when he spoke to the World Bank in the summer of 2001.

I believe that his vision for global economic success is best articulated through his creation of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, which encourages all nations to embrace political and economic reform. Through that program, the United States has pledged to increase its core development assistance by half, adding \$5 billion annually by 2006. To be eligible for this new money, nations must root out corruption, respect human rights, and adhere to the rule of law. They must invest in their people by improving their health care systems and their schools. They must unleash the energy and creativity necessary for economic growth by opening up their markets, removing barriers to entrepreneurship, and reducing excessive bureaucracy and regulation.

I believe this is the most progressive economic development idea of our times to deal with poverty in developing countries.

And I believe it is the idea that points the way for the Bretton Woods Institutions.

We must make aid available to countries that need it; but those countries must take responsibility as well. For governments that are not responsible and accountable to their own people, financial aid is a band-aid, and a tragedy in that it is not a solution for the people of those nations, people who seek and need a better life.

A better life is found through both political and economic freedom, period.

Economic opportunity is freedom's greatest catalyst as well as its most essential safeguard. Because business growth, free trade and financial reforms do lead to a better life for the citizens of any country. And with that better life comes an increased esteem for fairness, liberty and equality.

For example, it is for this reason that the renewed momentum of trade liberalization, including progress with the Doha Development Agenda, is so important.

I hate to over-simplify, but it is important to remember that economic growth creates jobs. And having a job means the same thing anywhere in the world, in any language -- it means you can provide for yourself and your loved ones. It means that your work ensures your survival and progress, without dependence on anyone else.

It is a cornerstone of individual liberty.

There is a reason why the United States has an economy that is the envy of the world. There is a reason why my counterparts in other countries ask me: "How did you do it? How did you recover so quickly and surely from September 11th, from the corporate scandals, from the bursting of the stock market bubble?"

In this country, we have always honored market movement over command and control. We have embraced free trade and the opportunities it brings -- both to our country and to those we do business with. Above all else, we have a unique appreciation of small enterprise. We encourage entrepreneurship like no one else.

The most powerful elements of the U.S. economy are our small-business owners and entrepreneurs, our outstanding workforce and the simple fact that we operate as a free market. As a result, we are fortunate to have an economy that is more open, flexible, adaptive and resilient than any other in the world.

Do we still hit rough spots? Of course we do. Every economy does. But we've also learned how to best right our economy at those times.

The President's tax cuts, combined with sound monetary policy from the Federal Reserve Board, created the stimulus that brought us out of our recent recession. Today we are experiencing strong GDP growth and steady job creation.

We're also working toward deficit reduction -- the President's plan will cut the deficit in half over five years. Because of the ongoing effects of the President's pro-growth economic policies, the deficit outlook continues to improve. To stay on this path, we need a continuation of the President's policies on spending discipline and economic growth.

Thanks to the President's leadership, we got our financial house in order and we expect other countries to do the same. Again, we expect responsibility.

Having that expectation leads to positive reforms. For example, it was the impetus for the recent introduction of a new system for measuring results at the World Bank, designed to make sure that critical indicators, such as immunization rates and school completion rates actually rise in poor countries.

We expect other countries to shape up, and move toward a future of economic freedom, opportunity and stability for their people.

Economic growth and prosperity are good for each of our nations, and they are good for each other. Growth in the U.S. is terrific for our trading partners and their growth is essential for our success. As a global economy, we have become more and more symbiotic, and this is broadly understood today.

That's why the wonderful consensus and collaboration among the countries of the G-7 is so important. We agree on having open economies, free trade, a free flow of capital. Last September, the G-7 all agreed on the key objective of making lasting changes to our economies that will help deliver stronger global growth that is broad-based and sustainable well into the future. We committed, together, to implement structural changes in our economies under what we have called the Agenda for Growth. This initiative focuses on reforms -- such as marginal tax rate reduction, labor market reform and regulatory changes -- that will boost productivity and employment and raise economic performance over the long term.

Each G-7 country has taken concrete actions to advance the Agenda for Growth, and I am proud to put the United States' reform agenda alongside others' efforts.

This commitment to the Agenda for Growth is historic; I know that the Bretton Woods Institutions understand and appreciate that fact. To have agreement on policies for growth is very different from the past. It was not long ago that we had centrally planned economies that did not bring a better life to the people who lived in them. Those days are part of the past, and we should all take great pride in this progress.

The G-7 has also achieved consensus on the necessity of flexible currencies, and on the importance of small and medium-sized businesses, and of investing in them.

I strongly encourage the Bretton Woods Institutions to give more aid to the private sector, particularly for capitalizing small business.

While I'm speaking of international cooperation, I would like to take a moment to mention the progress we have made in our fight against terrorism in the financial sector.

In partnership, the government and the private financial sectors have dedicated ourselves to tracking and cutting off the flow of blood money to the killers. Because while hatred fuels the terrorist agenda, money makes it possible.

The public and private financial communities have accomplished a lot together on this front over the past three years. The United States has designated 387 entities as terrorists or supporters of terrorists and frozen nearly \$142 million in terrorist-related assets. More than \$37 million has been frozen in the United States.

The U.S. has also identified and frozen over \$4.5 million in al Qaeda-related funds. In addition, almost \$72 million has been frozen by other governments worldwide.

Almost 1,500 terrorist-related accounts and transactions have been blocked around the world, including 151 in the United States.

The Bretton Woods Institutions are part of this fight, and I appreciate their partnership. Our efforts are making a difference.

I am also gratified by the remarkable successes in fund raising for economic reconstruction in Afghanistan, Iraq and Haiti. I still recall our meeting in Madrid where the IMF and World Bank pledged up to \$9.25 billion for reconstruction in Iraq. I congratulate the IMF and the Iraqis for the IMF program approved this week, and was very pleased to learn that the first project from the World Bank's trust fund for Iraq -- to finance new text books -- is moving

forward, and more than 12 million books will have been delivered by the time school begins next week.

The global financial community is achieving great things together. One risk of this improved global economic environment, however, is complacency -- something we absolutely must resist.

I believe the Bretton Woods Institutions have a responsibility to continue their own reforms, for example doing more to reinforce debt sustainability in poor countries. That requires private investment, but also a commitment to not making loans when it is highly probable that they will be forgiven. Grants and debt relief must be significantly increased -- we are considering more options to do so, including those that would provide up to 100 percent debt relief and grants from the international financial institutions. Employing both grants and debt relief together would give the poorest countries a chance to reach their international development goals of the Millennium Declaration without adding to debt burdens. I am working with my colleagues in the G-7 and other donors, with the institutions, and with recipient countries to achieve a consensus on the best way to solve the debt sustainability problem and ensure that our reforms only result in greater, not fewer, resources to poor countries.

I am pleased to see that the introduction of grant assistance at the World Bank, the African Development Bank and the Asian Development Bank is already proving to be successful and popular in recipient countries.

I also feel strongly that a new, non-borrowing facility ought to be established at the IMF, aimed at promoting strong country ownership and leadership in economic program design. This Policy Monitoring Arrangement would allow the IMF to signal its approval of countries' own economic policies in the absence of a funded program, and provide donors and markets with a regular assessment of policies. This would strengthen the IMF as an institution of international economic cooperation where each country assumes its responsibility for growth and stability. I welcomed the IMF Board's discussion on this issue last week, and I hope the IMFC can reach agreement this weekend to urge the IMF to move quickly to put this mechanism in place.

I am delighted by the level of attention that the G-7 Strategic Review has garnered around the world. I welcome in particular the personal interest that Rodrigo Rato has shown in the evolution of the strategic review since taking over as Managing Director of the IMF.

In closing, I want to repeat: The current condition of sustained economic growth and relative stability of the global financial system gives us a unique opportunity to build a consensus on reform, and more importantly, to move rapidly toward implementation.

There is too much at stake to be caught unaware by the next major threat to our financial system. The size and complexity of financial markets, for all their benefits, make us all vulnerable to disruption. And the magnitude of need and despair among the poorest countries is simply too great to quantify.

I urge us all to commit to work intensively together over the coming months, so that when we meet again next year, it will be to showcase the progress that has been made in a short time.

Tomorrow I will chair a meeting of the G-7, my last meeting as chairman before turning the position over to my good friend and colleague Chancellor Gordon Brown. I know he too wants to help the Bretton Woods institutions better reach their goals in a changing world. Indeed, just as the British and American Treasuries worked together 60 years ago to establish the Bretton Woods institutions, we have been working together to implement many of the reforms I discussed today. I wish Gordon well and I look forward to continuing to work with him on these important issues.

Thank you again for having me here today, and thank you for your work and commitment to global economic growth and financial stability.

*EPF408 09/30/2004

Text: U.S. Refugee Resettlement Policies Need Reform, Report Finds

("A new era" calls for change in Cold War policies)

The U.S. government needs to reform its policies and methods for resettling refugees, according to a report from a consultant hired by the Department of State's Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM) to conduct a review of the program.

"We are in a distinctively new era for refugee resettlement, and we need to recognize the true dimensions of the change," writes consultant David A. Martin, the Warner-Booker distinguished professor of international law at the University of Virginia, in the report's executive summary. The State Department released "Reforms for a New Era of Refugee Resettlement" September 29.

Congress adopted the current law governing this government activity, the Refugee Act, in 1980. Martin contrasts the current world situation of refugees to what existed then. Today, refugees who will be considered for resettlement in the United States are left stateless by civil war and environmental disaster. The nationality of such groups may change from one year to the next. In the 1970s and 1980s, however, U.S. refugee policy left an open door to anyone escaping the Soviet Union or Vietnam.

This new era "will require multiple decisions each year on resettling specific groups," Martin wrote, so "the challenge is to reform the U.S. decision making system, as well as certain operational practices," to facilitate the process.

The report recommends that the United States raise its sights on the number of refugees it admits each year. Current law calls upon the president to issue a presidential directive each year on the numbers of refugees that can be accepted. Since the 2001 terrorist attacks, actual admissions have never reached the allowable numbers because officials have been reviewing the entire process and enhancing security considerations.

Average annual admissions for the five years prior to 2001 averaged about 76,000. Martin cites 2002 and 2003 admissions as below 28,000 refugees each year. PRM acknowledges that decline, but predicts 2004 admissions will exceed 50,000.

Martin said agencies managing refugee resettlement should view the annual presidential directive not as a ceiling on admissions but a target to achieve. "The reality of this highly successful program suggests the value of a steady and reasonable high-capacity resettlement program," the report says.

The text of the executive summary follows:

The United States Refugee Admissions

Program: Reforms for a New Era of Refugee Resettlement

David A. Martin

Executive Summary

This summary presents in capsule form the main narrative of the report and its primary suggestions for reform of the US refugee admissions system. It is followed by a compilation of the formal recommendations that are scattered throughout the substantive chapters.

Introduction

The US Refugee Program is at a crossroads, and many people would say it is in crisis. The most obvious symptoms are a steep fall-off in refugee admissions for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, to below 28,000 annually. (For a comparison, actual refugee admissions for the previous five years averaged almost 76,000.) Because FY 2002 began 20 days after the September 11 terrorist attacks, observers often attribute the program's travails to the enhanced security measures introduced in response. Those measures played a role, but they are by no means the only source.

In fact, FY 2002 brought the United States to the end of several familiar elements of past refugee programs, placing us into a significantly new context for US refugee resettlement--a difficult transition whose dimensions were obscured by the September 11 responses. Largely gone are the massive, steady, and more predictably manageable programs that had dominated US admissions since the passage of the Refugee Act of 1980--the Indochinese and Soviet programs, followed for a few years by programs for those fleeing the former Yugoslavia. We are in a distinctively new era for refugee resettlement, and we need to recognize the true dimensions of the change. The new era brings both disadvantages and important new opportunities for the program to reflect on its core objectives and to respond to a wider range of genuine refugee needs.

For the future, refugee admissions will be characterized by the combination of many smaller-scale resettlement programs, mostly originating in difficult locations that will shift from year to year, each presenting significant and distinct policy challenges. The challenges consist not only of processing and logistics, though these are substantial, especially in an era of heightened security concerns. They consist also, and more importantly, of the complicated steps required to achieve agreement among the relevant US government--and often international--players on the groups and individuals that should be the beneficiaries of resettlement. A sensible system that does not make it too hard to say yes to new priority categories for resettlement is absolutely essential to our post-Cold-War refugee admissions program. Without the capacity to approve new resettlement initiatives nimbly, even expansive gains in operations, including in the security screening system, will not achieve significantly improved admissions. Without that capacity, we will also be unable to capitalize on genuine humanitarian opportunities that this new era presents.

Chapter I. The Context

There exist genuine and legitimate barriers and obstacles to resettlement, as well as factors that might properly counsel

against a resettlement initiative in specific circumstances. Critics of the US refugee program's recent performance often underestimate or obscure these challenges, while government officials take exception to critiques that do not do justice to the constraints under which they labor. In fact, refugee migrations and refugee resettlement represent highly complex phenomena. Refugee admissions cannot be based solely on any single-factored analysis. Instead, resettlement decisions must take careful account of the inherent dynamics of refugee situations, which vary greatly from place to place. A candid and rigorous look at those challenges is not antithetical to the vital humanitarian aims of refugee resettlement, but instead is necessary in order for the program to serve those aims more effectively.

Nonetheless, to acknowledge these points--to be more judicious in giving them their due weight--does not require surrendering to them. Reasons not to resettle a particular population may be legitimate, but they are rarely decisive. A major flaw in the current system is the lack of an institutional framework that consistently brings to bear the good reasons in favor of resettlement, at least for specific and carefully chosen groups, so that balanced and sensible choices can be reached to produce a US Refugee Program on the scale made possible by the President at the beginning of the fiscal year.

The major factors that need to be taken into account in deciding on any particular resettlement initiative include the following:

-- Pull factors and effects on other possible durable solutions. The worldwide refugee population is not a static pool that can simply be dipped into to ladle out however many refugees the United States or other resettlement countries might wish to admit. Because refugees and potential refugees are not just passive objects of international policy, but instead have objectives and life plans of their own, they exercise considerable choice over whether and when to leave their home countries and if so, where to go. People often will put up with great privations and risks in their home countries, for a variety of reasons. Introducing the prospect of resettlement out of refugee camps located in a nearby nation may make it far more attractive for more persons to leave their home country. This magnet effect or pull factor forms an increasingly pervasive worry for host countries and sometimes for the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in thinking about resettlement initiatives. Those parties also worry that providing a resettlement option will interfere with pursuit of other durable solutions -- local integration or voluntary repatriation.

-- Fraud, distortion, and corruption. The temptation to fraud is great in refugee programs, because resettlement often represents such a highly valued solution for persons in desperate situations. In today's conditions, the fraud problem has probably worsened, owing to modern communications and the growth of organized crime or other enterprises trying to make money from facilitating a person's inclusion in a resettlement program.

-- Toward a future of case-by-case decisions to resettle finite groups. Because of these and related factors, we are extremely unlikely in this new century to find the United States or any other country willing to make a virtually open-ended commitment to resettlement of virtually all who escape a designated nation--the type of commitment that prevailed for refugees from the Soviet Union and, for the first decade of the program, for Vietnamese refugee resettlement. Absent that sort of political decision, resettlement initiatives will be marked by the need to draw clear lines around the group to be admitted, so as to minimize fraud and to discourage future migration of others who might hope to be included in the resettlement. The quest will be for finite groups, and resettlement will work best if much solid work on identification and line-drawing can be completed before resettlement plans become known in the refugee camp or settlement.

In an era that will require multiple decisions each year on resettling specific groups, the challenge is to reform the US decisionmaking system, as well as certain operational practices, so that we can take better account of the positive arguments in favor of resettlement and fully deploy available measures that minimize the obstacles.

Fundamental choices. In order to take those steps, the program should indicate decisively that resettlement to the United States is not limited to a narrow rescue principle, taking only persons who face immediate, life threatening dangers. Increasingly it must be open to a wider concept of rescue, taking in, among others, refugees who have suffered from a protracted stay in camps that provide for meager productive activity, little schooling, and slim prospects for their children. With this broadened perspective on rescue, more potential resettlement populations come into view as possible candidates for a revitalized refugee admissions program, even while giving full attention to the constraining factors reviewed earlier in this Chapter.

The Presidential Determination (PD) number as a target, not a ceiling. The President sets an annual refugee admissions total at the beginning of the fiscal year. Historically, and with justification, officials have generally treated this number as a ceiling, not a target, meaning that

admissions shortfalls are not considered a failure of the system. This report argues for a policy decision to change that stance and treat the PD instead as a target. The annual refugee admission spaces have evolved into an increasingly well-established humanitarian resource to be employed in service of the nation's historic humanitarian objectives. Refugee admissions have drawn strong support from a coalition that cuts completely across party lines and other customary political or cultural divisions. This evolution has come about in significant part because of what this nation has learned about the human value of refugee admissions. There are countervailing currents, to be sure, and remaining skepticism about some elements of the refugee program that deserve to be taken seriously. But the reality of this highly successful program suggests the value of a steady and reasonably high-capacity resettlement program, even after the decline of its historic mainstay components, the Indochinese and Soviet bloc programs.

Deciding to treat the PD number as a target would provide a benchmark for accountability of the various actors in the system, and it would also serve as a sorely needed counterweight to the negative arguments that are usually easy to marshal against any particular resettlement initiative. To serve these ends, the PD number will have to be set with realism and care; massive or sudden increases in admissions are not likely, given that admissions today will be largely composed of a series of smaller-group initiatives.

Chapter II. Reforming the System for Deciding on Resettlement Initiatives

Refugee admissions derive from individual case referrals, family-based access to the program, and group-based access. For the foreseeable future, major gains in admissions will have to come from the group designation process. In the current era, with the decline of the former large-scale and multi-year admissions programs, this could easily require the State Department's Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM) to begin serious group-access development work on approximately one new group per month.

The PRM Admissions Office staff should be augmented for these purposes, and PRM needs to manifest a sense of mission about this process. Without abandoning its own critical perspective on admissions proposals, the Admissions Office must come to think of itself as the component in the decisionmaking system that gives the benefit of the doubt to resettlement, so as to serve as a counterweight to negative arguments that will readily appear from other governmental or international quarters.

Further institutional changes should also be made to maximize the likely success of PRM's new efforts and to assure adequate attention to refugee resettlement by all the key units of the Department of State and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). This report spells out one possible framework for such a change, modeled on a procedure used to help institutionalize human rights policy when it was a relatively new arena for systematic US action. The Department of State should establish a Refugee Admissions Committee, to be chaired by the Assistant Secretary for PRM, meeting at least bimonthly to consider the progress of resettlement initiatives and to develop common standards and procedures for their evaluation. The regional bureaus of the State Department, the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) from DHS, and other relevant units should participate.

The Committee could helpfully divide its group selection task into three levels. Staff could initially present for consideration potential groups, for whom some very basic investigative work has been done. From among them, the Committee would select the more promising as candidate groups, worthy of far more detailed inquiry. It will usually prove worthwhile to undertake discreet field inquiry involving such groups, often making use of PRM's current initiative for "targeted response teams." Such teams should include selected NGO representatives, to make use of their expertise, as well as DHS personnel, to ensure that any issues of importance to DHS will be given full consideration early in the group development process. After such inquiry, the Committee deliberations would lead to the choice of designated groups, for whom full resettlement processing would be launched. The Committee's procedures could also be used productively to assure timely completion and submission to Congress of the annual refugee admissions consultation document.

Chapter III. The Priority System for Access to the Admissions Program and Arrangements for Urgent Cases

The priority system structures access to the US Refugee Program. The report considers proposals for broad reform of these categories, but recommends a more modest revision, to align the priorities with the functional categories that dominate admissions. (This requires only modest changes to current practice.) P-1 would be the category for access based on individual referrals, P-2 for all forms of group access, and P-3 for access for the spouse, minor unmarried children, and parents of persons already admitted to the United States. Any UNHCR group referral (now treated as a "P-1 group") would henceforth be considered as part of the P-2 category, using the mechanism of the Refugee Admissions Committee to make a final decision on acceptance of the referral.

The report discusses specific suggestions for focused reforms to the three main types of priority access. PRM should make a particular effort to give close attention to NGO suggestions for groups to be considered. No legislative sanction is needed or desirable for that sort of input. Concomitantly, NGOs should work to address more concretely and systematically the trade-offs, barriers, and obstacles that affect any group resettlement initiative -- the sort of issues addressed in Chapter I. For family-based access, the report suggests improvements in the "Visas 93" process, which is universally available to the spouses and minor unmarried children of refugees who are "following to join" the anchor refugee already in the United States, but which has been marked by problems in many locations. Family-based access through the P-3 category has suffered in recent years from widespread fraud, but the system is now far better equipped to detect and deter such manipulation, primarily through the workings of DHS's Refugee Access Verification Unit (RAVU). Fraud patterns change, and the system will have to cope with those innovations, but RAVU provides a reasonably good institutional home for responding to new schemes. Greater use of DNA testing should be considered, particularly if such a mechanism would make it easier to consider wider use of family-based access to US admissions.

Many people have proposed a universal P-3 category -- that is, making P-3 admissions available to all nationalities. The report places this proposal in perspective. Because the Visas 93 mechanism is a universal family reunification provision, proposals for a universal P-3 address mainly the situation of parents of persons resident in the United States -- an important but less compelling type of family reunification. Moreover, PRM tries to place on the annual P-3 list those nationalities most likely to generate admissions at a level that is practical for processing through circuit rides; hence a universal P-3 is unlikely to generate high levels of new admissions. Nonetheless, the report recommends consideration of a carefully tailored universal P-3 program on a trial basis.

The United States should also restore the US capacity to admit truly urgent cases, wherein immediate threats call for movement of the refugee to a resettlement country within a few days or weeks. Post-September 11 security requirements have made such admissions far more difficult, but this capacity can be quite important for a modest number of cases each year. The program should strive to admit such persons as refugees rather than parolees.

Chapter IV. The Role of the Department of Homeland Security

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) fulfills certain critical functions in the refugee admissions system, primarily focused on interviewing applicants and approving their refugee claims before they can travel to the United States as part of the refugee admissions program. The split of immigration enforcement and immigration services functions among three separate bureaus in the new Department has caused some difficulties. The Department should develop a better structure for resolving internal differences over immigration- and refugee-related guidance and policy, in a way that gives full consideration to services-based considerations.

The report contains suggestions for improvements in the individual adjudications of refugee claims, including ideas for better training and guidance for officers who are about to embark on a circuit ride. Interview-site security is legitimately a high-priority issue for DHS, but a good cooperative relationship with embassy security officers now generally exists, facilitating the identification and strengthening of suitable sites. DHS should also continue exploring technological innovations, such as video hookups, that might permit interviewing from a remote location when security risks are high in a refugee settlement.

DHS has committed itself to the development of a specialized Refugee Corps, composed of officers devoted full-time to refugee issues. This step is welcome, providing exactly the kind of innovation needed to deal with this new era of refugee resettlement, wherein most processing will be done by circuit-ride teams rather than permanently stationed staff. Recruitment and deployment of the corps should move ahead as speedily as possible.

Chapter V. Operational Issues and an Overview of the Resettlement Process

Although the system used to resettle a refugee in the United States constitutes an impressive achievement and admirably meshes the efforts of government officers, NGO representatives, and international organization personnel, its evolution has left us with highly complex machinery. Interviews for this project revealed that even some persons deeply involved and expert in certain parts of the process may have only a dim conception of other key elements. Occasionally affirmative misunderstandings about what goes on in another part of the process have led to operational confusion, exaggerated expectations, or even anger or accusations of bad faith. A modest measure of operational improvement could be achieved simply by assuring that persons who play key roles in any part of the

process are trained or briefed on the operations of the other actors and the constraints they face. This chapter therefore opens with a detailed account of the process, covering these basic steps:

- access
- case preparation by an Overseas Processing Entity (OPE)
- security screening
- DHS interview
- simultaneous processes:
- medical screening
- sponsor assurance
- cultural orientation
- travel arrangements through the International Organization for Migration (IOM)
- US port of entry procedures
- arrival at destination

Overall management. The division of key responsibilities between PRM and DHS, and of other responsibilities among various other governmental players, NGOs, and international institutions, definitely impairs accountability and authority to solve problems that crop up in operations. Although an ideal organizational fix might call for unification of central responsibility in a single entity, such a solution is not feasible for the admissions program. Refugee admission decisions have important foreign policy dimensions and involve close coordination with UNHCR and other international players. Thus the State Department inevitably plays a central role. It is also inconceivable in the post-September 11 climate that the DHS role would be reduced or eliminated. We are fated to continue with a diffuse process.

The key offices therefore must take a resolutely managerial and systemic approach to resolving operational issues. In the past, operational issues have been resolved or worked around for a specific resettlement initiative. But on too few occasions did the experience become the basis for broader systemic modifications, to make sure that similar problems do not recur in future refugee processing. This orientation needs to change. The imperative task is to learn from specific problems, find generalizable solutions, and, in a disciplined fashion, make them part of standard operating

procedures to be implemented in both existing and future resettlement initiatives.

Specific operational recommendations. The balance of Chapter V addresses specific operational issues. (See the compilation of recommendations that follows this Executive Summary.) One of the most contentious has to do with the role of Overseas Processing Entities. Yet much of the sharp debate appears to derive from each person's exaggerated perceptions of the views or actions of other players involved in the OPE process. In practice, I detected a larger area of common ground between NGOs, government officials, IOM, and others who spoke out on this question than is generally appreciated. What is most needed with regard to OPEs is for these parties to undertake a concerted effort to discuss the details of operations and roles that have raised such sensitivities, to reach a common set of understandings about the OPE role, whoever is performing it, and then to embody those understandings in concrete guidance and standard operating procedures. The report highlights the main questions that should be addressed.

Chapter VI. The Role of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees

For over 50 years, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) has played a central role in the world community's response to refugee needs, and for most of this time it has also occupied a significant position in the functioning of the US resettlement program. Not only have US officers coordinated closely with UNHCR in many locations for operational purposes, to mutual advantage, but UNHCR also carries major responsibilities in the process that leads to actual selection of those refugees admitted to the United States. Two main areas of UNHCR functioning have drawn attention recently as fields where reforms could help secure major resettlement improvements: increasing use of group referrals, including the development of a new UNHCR group referral methodology, and improved registration practices. The report discusses these changes, considers criticisms and suggestions for improvements, and urges strong US support for these UNHCR initiatives.

Chapter VII. Statutory Amendments

Twenty-four years of experience under the Refugee Act of 1980 reveal some portions of the statute that have not worked out as intended or have had unforeseen negative effects. A few carefully targeted statutory changes could facilitate improvements. Although proposals for legislative involvement raise some risk of unwanted complications, the report urges close consideration of six specific changes. The last one could be the most useful in restoring historic admissions levels, improving the efficiency of the

adjudication system, and enabling effective response to pressing needs of the world's displaced, particularly those stuck in meager camps in protracted refugee situations.

- Provide for continued refugee movements at the beginning of the fiscal year, even if the Presidential Determination is delayed.
- Allow congressional consultation by both Cabinet secretaries and deputy secretaries.
- Repeal the ceiling on asylee adjustments.
- Reconsider the ceiling on refugee and asylee status grants based on coercive population control measures.
- Consider admitting overseas refugees as lawful permanent residents.
- Allow the President to designate specific classes of persons to be admitted as '207 refugees without individually applying the UN Convention's refugee definition.

*EPF409 09/30/2004

Text: 2006 U.S. Visa Lottery Opens in November

(Program offers 50,000 permanent visas for immigrants to the United States)

The U.S. Department of State will issue 50,000 permanent residency visas to the winners of a lottery that opens for registration November 6.

Applications from would-be immigrants in eligible countries will be accepted from November 5 through January 7, 2005, the State Department announced September 29. The program is formally known as the Diversity Visa Lottery because it offers visas to citizens of nations that have a traditionally low level of immigration to the United States. In so doing, it is designed to bring greater racial and ethnic diversity to the nation.

The State Department announcement also provides detailed information about the requirements of the program, the eligibility of applicants and the application process.

For the second year in a row, applications will only be accepted electronically through a specially designated Web site -- <http://www.dvlottery.state.gov> -- that will be activated when the application process begins. No paper applications will be accepted.

The text of the media note, with the requirements for entry, follows:

U.S. Department of State
Media Note
Office of the Spokesman
Washington, DC
September 29, 2004

2006 Diversity Visa Lottery Program Registration

Applications for the 2006 Diversity Visa (DV) Lottery will be accepted between November 5, 2004 and January 7, 2005. Persons seeking to apply must register electronically, online through the designated Internet website, www.dvlottery.state.gov during the registration period. The 2006 Diversity Visa Lottery marks the second year that electronic registration is required. Paper entries and mail-in requests for Diversity Visa Lottery registration are not accepted.

The Department of State implemented the electronic registration system last year for the 2005 Diversity Visa Lottery to improve efficiency and make the process less prone to fraud, thus making it less vulnerable to use by persons who may pose a threat to the security interests of the United States.

The congressionally mandated Diversity Immigrant Visa Program is administered on an annual basis by the Department of State and conducted under the terms of Section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). Section 131 of the Immigration Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101-649) amended INA 203 to provide for a new class of immigrants known as "diversity immigrants" (DV immigrants). The Act makes available 50,000 permanent resident visas annually to persons from countries with low rates of immigration to the United States.

The annual DV program makes permanent residence visas available to persons meeting the simple, but strict, eligibility requirements. Diversity Visa entries are chosen by a computer-generated random lottery drawing. The visas, however, are distributed among six geographic regions with a greater number of visas going to regions with lower rates of immigration, and with no visas going to citizens of countries sending more than 50,000 immigrants to the U.S. in the past five years. Within each region, no one country may receive more than seven percent of the available Diversity Visas in any one year.

For DV-2006, natives of the following countries [1] are not eligible to apply because they sent a total of more than 50,000 immigrants to the U.S. in the previous five years:

CANADA, CHINA (mainland-born), COLOMBIA, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, EL SALVADOR, HAITI, INDIA, JAMAICA, MEXICO, PAKISTAN, PHILIPPINES, RUSSIA, SOUTH KOREA, UNITED KINGDOM (except Northern Ireland) and its dependent territories, and VIETNAM. Persons born in Hong Kong SAR, Macau SAR and Taiwan are eligible.

[1]The term "country" in this notice includes countries, economies and other jurisdictions explicitly listed beginning on page 13.

REQUIREMENTS FOR ENTRY

--- Applicant must be a native of one of the countries listed beginning on page 13. See "List Of Countries By Region Whose Natives Qualify."

Native of a country whose natives qualify: In most cases this means the country in which the applicant was born. However, there are two other ways a person may be able to qualify. First, if a person was born in a country whose natives are ineligible but his/her spouse was born in a country whose natives are eligible, such person can claim the spouse's country of birth provided both the applicant and spouse are issued visas and enter the U.S. simultaneously. Second, if a person was born in a country whose natives are ineligible, but neither of his/her parents was born there or resided there at the time of his/her birth, such person may claim nativity in one of the parents' country of birth if it is a country whose natives qualify for the DV-2006 program.

--- Applicant must meet either the education or training requirement of the DV program.

Education or Training: An applicant must have EITHER a high school education or its equivalent, defined as successful completion of a 12-year course of elementary and secondary education; OR two years of work experience within the past five years in an occupation requiring at least two years of training or experience to perform. The U.S. Department of Labor's O*Net OnLine database will be used to determine qualifying work experience.

If the applicant cannot meet these requirements, he or she should NOT submit an entry to the DV program.

PROCEDURES FOR SUBMITTING AN ENTRY TO DV-2006

--The Department of State will only accept completed Electronic Diversity Visa Entry Forms submitted electronically at www.dvlottery.state.gov during the

registration period beginning at 12:00 pm EST (GMT-5) on November 5, 2004 and ending at 12:00 pm EST (GMT-5) on January 7, 2005.

--All entries by an applicant will be disqualified if more than ONE entry for the applicant is received, regardless of who submitted the entry. Applicants may prepare and submit their own entries, or have someone submit the entry for them.

--Successfully registered entries will result in the display of a confirmation screen containing the applicant's name, date of birth, country of chargeability, and a date/time stamp. The applicant may print this confirmation screen for his/her records using the print function of their web browser.

--Paper entries will not be accepted.

--The entry will be disqualified if all required photos are not submitted. Recent photographs of the applicant and his/her spouse and each child under 21 years of age, including all natural children as well as all legally-adopted and stepchildren (except a child who is already a U.S. citizen or a Legal Permanent Resident), even if a child no longer resides with the applicant or is not intended to immigrate under the DV program, must be submitted electronically with the Electronic Diversity Visa Entry Form. Group or family photos will not be accepted; there must be a separate photo for each family member.

A digital photo (image) of each applicant, his/her spouse, and children must be submitted on-line with the EDV Entry Form. The image file can be produced either by taking a new digital photograph or by scanning a photographic print with a digital scanner.

Instructions for Submitting a Digital Photo (Image)

The image file must adhere to the following compositional specifications and technical specifications and can be produced in one of the following ways:

--Taking a new digital image.

--Using a digital scanner to scan a submitted photograph.

Compositional Specifications: The submitted digital image must conform to the following compositional specifications or the entry will be disqualified.

--Head Position

-- Person being photographed must directly face the camera.

--- Head of the person should not be tilted up, down, or to the side.

--- Head of the person should cover about 50% of the area of the photo.

--Background

--- Person being photographed should be in front of a neutral, light-colored background.

--- Dark or patterned backgrounds are not acceptable.

--Focus

--- Photo must be in focus.

--Decorative Items

--- Photos in which the person being photographed is wearing sunglasses or other items that detract from the face will not be accepted.

--Head Coverings and Hats

--- Photos of applicants wearing head coverings or hats are only acceptable due to religious beliefs, and even then, may not obscure any portion of the face of the applicant.

--- Photos of applicants with tribal or other headgear not specifically religious in nature will not be accepted.

--- Photos of military, airline, or other personnel wearing hats will not be accepted.

Technical Specifications: The submitted digital photograph must conform to the following specifications or the system will automatically reject the EDV Entry Form and notify the sender.

--Taking a New Digital Image. If a new digital image is taken, it must meet the following specifications:

---Image File Format:

The image must be in the Joint Photographic Experts Group (JPEG) format.

--Image File Size:

The maximum image file size will be sixty-two thousand five hundred (62,500) bytes.

--Image Resolution:

320 pixels high by 240 pixels wide.

--Image Color Depth:

24-bit color or 8-bit color or 8-bit grayscale. [Note: Monochrome images (2-bit color depth) will not be accepted.]

--Scanning a Submitted Photograph. Before a photographic print is scanned, it must meet the following specifications:

---Print Size:

2 inches by 2 inches (50mm x 50mm) square.

--Print Color:

The image must be either in color or grayscale.

The photographic print must also meet the Compositional Specifications. If the photographic print meets the Print Size, Print Color, and Compositional Specifications, scan the print using the following scanner specifications.

--Scanner Resolution:

Scanned at a resolution of 150 dots per inch (dpi).

--Image File Format:

The image must be in the Joint Photographic Experts Group (JPEG) format.

--Image File Size:

The maximum image file size will be sixty-two thousand five hundred (62,500) bytes.

--Image Resolution:

300 by 300 pixels.

--Image Color Depth:

24-bit color or 8-bit color or 8-bit grayscale. [Note: Monochrome images (2-bit color depth) will not be accepted.]

THE ENTRY

There is only one way to enter the DV-2006 lottery. Applicants must submit an Electronic Diversity Visa Entry Form (EDV Entry Form), which is accessible only at www.dvlottery.state.gov. Failure to complete the form in its entirety will disqualify the applicant's entry. Applicants will be asked to submit the following information on the EDV Entry Form.

1. FULL NAME - Last/Family Name, First Name, Middle name
2. DATE OF BIRTH - Day, Month, Year
3. GENDER - Male or Female
4. CITY/TOWN OF BIRTH
5. COUNTRY OF BIRTH - The name of the country should be that which is currently in use for the place where the applicant was born.
6. APPLICANT PHOTOGRAPH - See page 2 for information on photo specifications.
7. MAILING ADDRESS - Address, City/Town, District/Country/Province/State, Postal Code/Zip Code, Country
8. PHONE NUMBER (optional)
9. E-MAIL ADDRESS (optional)
10. COUNTRY OF ELIGIBILITY IF THE APPLICANT'S NATIVE COUNTRY IS DIFFERENT FROM COUNTRY OF BIRTH - If the applicant is claiming nativity in a country other than his/her place of birth, this information must be indicated on the entry.
11. MARITAL STATUS - Unmarried, Married, Divorced, Widowed, Legally Separated
12. NUMBER OF CHILDREN THAT ARE UNMARRIED AND UNDER 21 YEARS OF AGE - Except children that are either U.S. legal permanent residents or American citizens.
13. SPOUSE INFORMATION - Name, Date of Birth, Gender, City/Town of Birth, Country of Birth, Photograph
14. CHILDREN INFORMATION - Name, Date of Birth, Gender, City/Town of Birth, Country of Birth, Photograph

NOTE: Entries must include the name, date and place of birth of the applicant's spouse and all natural children, as well as all legally-adopted and stepchildren, who are unmarried and under the age of 21 (except children who are already U.S. citizens or Legal Permanent Residents), even if you are no longer legally married to the child's parent, and even if the spouse or child does not currently reside with you and/or will not immigrate with you. Note that married children and children 21 years or older will not qualify for the diversity visa. Failure to list all children will result in your disqualification for the visa. (See question 11 on the list of Frequently Asked Questions.)

SELECTION OF APPLICANTS

Applicants will be selected at random by computer from among all qualified entries. Those selected will be notified by mail between May and July 2005 and will be provided further instructions, including information on fees connected with immigration to the U.S. Persons not selected will NOT receive any notification. U.S. embassies and consulates will not be able to provide a list of successful applicants. Spouses and unmarried children under age 21 of successful applicants may also apply for visas to accompany or follow to join the principal applicant. DV-2006 visas will be issued between October 1, 2005 and September 30, 2006.

In order to actually receive a visa, applicants selected in the random drawing must meet ALL eligibility requirements under U.S. law. Processing of entries and issuance of diversity visas to successful applicants and their eligible family members MUST occur by midnight on September 30, 2006. Under no circumstances can diversity visas be issued or adjustments approved after this date, nor can family members obtain diversity visas to follow to join the applicant in the U.S. after this date.

Important Notice

No fee is charged to enter the annual DV program. The U.S. Government employs no outside consultants or private services to operate the DV program. Any intermediaries or others who offer assistance to prepare DV casework for applicants do so without the authority or consent of the U.S. Government. Use of any outside intermediary or assistance to prepare a DV entry is entirely at the applicant's discretion.

A qualified entry submitted electronically directly by an applicant has an equal chance of being selected by the computer at the Kentucky Consular Center as does an entry submitted electronically through a paid intermediary who completes the entry for the applicant. Every entry received

during the lottery registration period will have an equal random chance of being selected within its region. However, receipt of more than one entry per person will disqualify the person from registration, regardless of the source of the entry.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT DV REGISTRATION

1. WHAT DOES THE TERM "NATIVE" MEAN? ARE THERE ANY SITUATIONS IN WHICH PERSONS WHO WERE NOT BORN IN A QUALIFYING COUNTRY MAY APPLY?

"Native" ordinarily means someone born in a particular country, regardless of the individual's current country of residence or nationality. But for immigration purposes "native" can also mean someone who is entitled to be "charged" to a country other than the one in which he/she was born under the provisions of Section 202(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

For example, if a principal applicant was born in a country that is not eligible for this year's DV program, he/she may claim "chargeability" to the country where his/her derivative spouse was born, but he/she will not be issued a DV-1 unless the spouse is also eligible for and issued a DV-2, and both must enter the U.S. together on the DVs. In a similar manner, a minor dependent child can be "charged" to a parent's country of birth.

Finally, any applicant born in a country ineligible for this year's DV program can be "charged" to the country of birth of either parent as long as neither parent was a resident of the ineligible country at the time of the applicant's birth. In general, people are not considered residents of a country in which they were not born or legally naturalized if they are only visiting the country temporarily or stationed in the country for business or professional reasons on behalf of a company or government.

An applicant who claims alternate chargeability must indicate such information on the application for registration.

2. ARE THERE ANY CHANGES OR NEW REQUIREMENTS IN THE APPLICATION PROCEDURES FOR THIS DIVERSITY VISA REGISTRATION?

All DV-2006 lottery entries must be submitted electronically at www.dvlottery.state.gov between Friday, November 5, 2004 and Friday, January 7, 2005. No paper entries will be accepted.

The Department of State implemented an electronic registration system for last year's lottery in order to make the Diversity Visa process more efficient and secure. The Department utilizes special technology and other means to identify applicants who commit fraud for the purposes of illegal immigration or who submit multiple entries.

The DV-2006 Diversity Immigrant Visa Program registration period will run from noon Eastern Standard Time November 5, 2004 through noon Eastern Standard Time January 7, 2005.

3. ARE SIGNATURES AND PHOTOGRAPHS REQUIRED FOR EACH FAMILY MEMBER, OR ONLY FOR THE PRINCIPAL APPLICANT?

Signatures are not required on the Electronic Diversity Visa Entry Form. Recent and individual photos of the applicant, his/her spouse and all children under 21 years of age are required. Family or group photos are not accepted. Check the information on the photo requirements on page 2 of this bulletin.

4. WHY DO NATIVES OF CERTAIN COUNTRIES NOT QUALIFY FOR THE DIVERSITY PROGRAM?

Diversity visas are intended to provide an immigration opportunity for persons from countries other than the countries that send large numbers of immigrants to the U.S. The law states that no diversity visas shall be provided for natives of "high admission" countries. The law defines this to mean countries from which a total of 50,000 persons in the Family-Sponsored and Employment-Based visa categories immigrated to the United States during the previous five years. Each year, the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) adds the family and employment immigrant admission figures for the previous five years in order to identify the countries whose natives must be excluded from the annual diversity lottery. Because there is a separate determination made before each annual DV entry period, the list of countries whose natives do not qualify may change from one year to the next.

5. WHAT IS THE NUMERICAL LIMIT FOR DV-2006?

By law, the U.S. diversity immigration program makes available a maximum of 55,000 permanent residence visas each year to eligible persons. However, the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act (NACARA) passed by Congress in November 1997 stipulates that beginning as early as DV-99, and for as long as necessary, 5,000 of the 55,000 annually-allocated diversity visas will be made available for use under the NACARA program. The

actual reduction of the limit to 50,000 began with DV-2000 and remains in effect for the DV-2006 program.

6. WHAT ARE THE REGIONAL DIVERSITY VISA (DV) LIMITS FOR DV-2006?

The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) determines the DV regional limits for each year according to a formula specified in Section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). Once the USCIS has completed the calculations, the regional visa limits will be announced.

7. WHEN WILL ENTRIES FOR THE DV-2006 PROGRAM BE ACCEPTED?

The DV-2006 entry period will begin on noon EST Friday, November 5, 2004 and will last for 63 days through noon EST Friday, January 7, 2005. Each year millions apply for the program during the registration period. The massive volume of entries creates an enormous amount of work in selecting and processing successful applicants. Holding the entry period during November and December will ensure successful applicants are notified in a timely manner, and provides both the applicants and our embassies and consulates time to prepare and complete entries for visa issuance. Applicants are strongly encouraged to enter early in the registration period. Excessive demand at end of the registration period may slow the system down. No entries whatsoever will be accepted after noon EST Friday, January 7, 2005.

8. MAY PERSONS WHO ARE IN THE U.S. APPLY FOR THE PROGRAM?

Yes, an applicant may be in the U.S. or in another country, and the entry may be submitted from the U.S. or from abroad.

9. IS EACH APPLICANT LIMITED TO ONLY ONE ENTRY DURING THE ANNUAL DV REGISTRATION PERIOD?

Yes, the law allows only one entry by or for each person during each registration period; applicants for whom more than one entry is submitted will be disqualified. The Department of State will employ sophisticated technology and other means to identify individuals that submit multiple entries during the registration period. Applicants submitting more than one entry will be disqualified and an electronic record will be permanently maintained by the Department of State. Applicants may apply for the program each year during the regular registration period.

10. MAY A HUSBAND AND A WIFE EACH SUBMIT A SEPARATE ENTRY?

Yes, a husband and a wife may each submit one entry if each meets the eligibility requirements. If either were selected, the other would be entitled to derivative status.

11. WHAT FAMILY MEMBERS MUST I INCLUDE ON MY DV ENTRY?

On your entry you must list your spouse, that is husband or wife, and all unmarried children under 21 years of age, with the exception of children who are already U.S. citizens or Legal Permanent Residents. You must list your spouse even if you are currently separated from him/her, unless you are legally separated (i.e. there is a written agreement recognized by a court or a court order.) If you are legally separated or divorced, you do not need to list your former spouse. You must list ALL your children who are unmarried and under 21 years of age, whether they are your natural children, your spouse's children, or children you have formally adopted in accordance with the laws of your country, unless such child is already a U.S. citizen or Legal Permanent Resident. List all children under 21 years of age even if they no longer reside with you or you do not intend for them to immigrate under the DV program.

The fact that you have listed family members on your entry does not mean that they later must travel with you. They may choose to remain behind. However, if you include an eligible dependent on your visa application forms that you failed to include on your original entry, your case will be disqualified. (This only applies to persons who were dependents at the time the original application was submitted, not those acquired at a later date.) Your spouse may still submit a separate entry, even though he or she is listed on your entry, as long as both entries include details on all dependents in your family. See question 10 above.

12. MUST EACH APPLICANT SUBMIT HIS/HER OWN ENTRY, OR MAY SOMEONE ACT ON BEHALF OF AN APPLICANT?

Applicants may prepare and submit their own entries, or have someone submit the entry for them. Regardless of whether an entry is submitted by the applicant directly, or assistance is provided by an attorney, friend, relative, etc., only one entry may be submitted in the name of each person. If the entry is selected, the notification letter will be sent only to the mailing address provided on the entry.

13. WHAT ARE THE REQUIREMENTS FOR EDUCATION OR WORK EXPERIENCE?

The law and regulations require that every applicant must have at least a high school education or its equivalent or, within the past five years, have two years of work

experience in an occupation requiring at least two years training or experience. A "high school education or equivalent" is defined as successful completion of a twelve-year course of elementary and secondary education in the United States or successful completion in another country of a formal course of elementary and secondary education comparable to a high school education in the United States. Documentary proof of education or work experience should not be submitted with the lottery entry, but must be presented to the consular officer at the time of the visa interview. To determine eligibility based on work experience, definitions from the Department of Labor's O*Net OnLine database will be used.

14. HOW WILL SUCCESSFUL ENTRANTS BE SELECTED?

At the Kentucky Consular Center, all entries received from each region will be individually numbered. After the end of the registration period, a computer will randomly select entries from among all the entries received for each geographic region. Within each region, the first entry randomly selected will be the first case registered, the second entry selected the second registration, etc. All entries received during the registration period will have an equal chance of being selected within each region. When an entry has been selected, the applicant will be sent a notification letter by the Kentucky Consular Center, which will provide visa application instructions. The Kentucky Consular Center will continue to process the case until those who are selected are instructed to appear for visa interviews at a U.S. consular office, or until those able to do so apply at a USCIS office in the United States for change of status.

15. MAY WINNING APPLICANTS ADJUST THEIR STATUS WITH USCIS?

Yes, provided they are otherwise eligible to adjust status under the terms of Section 245 of the INA, selected applicants who are physically present in the United States may apply to the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) for adjustment of status to permanent resident. Applicants must ensure that USCIS can complete action on their cases, including processing of any overseas derivatives, before September 30, 2006, since on that date registrations for the DV-2006 program expire. No visa numbers for the DV-2006 program will be available after midnight on September 30, 2006 under any circumstances.

16. WILL APPLICANTS WHO ARE NOT SELECTED BE INFORMED?

No, applicants who are not selected will receive no response to their entry. Only those who are selected will be

informed. All notification letters are sent within about five to seven months from the end of the application period to the address indicated on the entry. Since there is no notification provided to those not selected, anyone who does not receive a letter about five to seven months from the end of the registration period should assume that his/her application has not been selected.

17. HOW MANY APPLICANTS WILL BE SELECTED?

There are 50,000 DV visas available for DV-2006, but more than that number of individuals will be selected. Because it is likely that some of the first 50,000 persons who are selected will not qualify for visas or pursue their cases to visa issuance, more than 50,000 entries will be selected by the Kentucky Consular Center to ensure that all of the available DV visas are issued. However, this also means that there will not be a sufficient number of visas for all those who are initially selected. All applicants who are selected will be informed promptly of their place on the list. Interviews with those selected will begin in early October 2005. The Kentucky Consular Center will send appointment letters to selected applicants four to six weeks before the scheduled interviews with U.S. consular officers at overseas posts. Each month visas will be issued, visa number availability permitting, to those applicants who are ready for issuance during that month. Once all of the 50,000 DV visas have been issued, the program for the year will end. In principle, visa numbers could be finished before September 2006. Selected applicants who wish to receive visas must be prepared to act promptly on their cases. Random selection by the Kentucky Consular Center computer does not automatically guarantee that you will receive a visa.

18. IS THERE A MINIMUM AGE FOR APPLICANTS TO APPLY FOR THE DV PROGRAM?

There is no minimum age to apply for the program, but the requirement of a high school education or work experience for each principal applicant at the time of application will effectively disqualify most persons who are under age 18.

19. ARE THERE ANY FEES FOR THE DV PROGRAM?

There is no fee for submitting an entry. A special DV case processing fee will be payable later by persons whose entries are actually selected and processed at a U.S. consular section for this year's program. DV applicants, like other immigrant visa applicants, must also pay the regular visa fees at the time of visa application. Details of required fees will be included with the instructions sent by the Kentucky Consular Center to applicants who are selected.

20. ARE DV APPLICANTS SPECIALLY ENTITLED TO APPLY FOR A WAIVER OF ANY OF THE GROUNDS OF VISA INELIGIBILITY?

No. Applicants are subject to all grounds of ineligibility for immigrant visas specified in the Immigration and Nationality Act. There are no special provisions for the waiver of any ground of visa ineligibility other than those ordinarily provided in the Act.

21. MAY PERSONS WHO ARE ALREADY REGISTERED FOR AN IMMIGRANT VISA IN ANOTHER CATEGORY APPLY FOR THE DV PROGRAM?

Yes, such persons may apply for the DV program.

22. HOW LONG DO APPLICANTS WHO ARE SELECTED REMAIN ENTITLED TO APPLY FOR VISAS IN THE DV CATEGORY?

Persons selected in the DV-2006 lottery are entitled to apply for visa issuance only during fiscal year 2006, i.e., from October 2005 through September 2006. Applicants must obtain the DV visa or adjust status by the end of the Fiscal Year (September 30, 2006). There is no carry-over of DV benefits into the next year for persons who are selected but who do not obtain visas during FY-2006. Also, spouses and children who derive status from a DV-2006 registration can only obtain visas in the DV category between October 2005 and September 2006. Applicants who apply overseas will receive an appointment letter from the Kentucky Consular Center four to six weeks before the scheduled appointment.

23. WHEN WILL E-DV ONLINE BE AVAILABLE?

Online entry will become available at 12:00 pm EST (GMT-5) on November 5, 2004 and will end at 12:00 pm EST (GMT-5) on January 7, 2005.

24. WILL I BE ABLE TO DOWNLOAD AND SAVE THE E-DV ENTRY FORM TO A MICROSOFT WORD PROGRAM (OR OTHER SUITABLE PROGRAM) AND THEN FILL IT OUT?

No, you will not be able to save the form into another program for completion and submission later. The E-DV Entry Form is a Web form only. This makes it more "universal" than a proprietary word processor format. Additionally, it does require that the information be filled in and submitted while on-line.

25. IF I DON'T HAVE ACCESS TO A SCANNER, CAN I SEND PHOTOS TO MY RELATIVE IN THE U.S. TO SCAN THE PHOTOS, SAVE THE PHOTOS TO A DISKETTE,

AND THEN MAIL THE DISKETTE BACK TO ME TO APPLY?

Yes, this can be done as long as the photo meets the photo requirements in the instructions, and the photo is electronically submitted with, and at the same time the E-DV online entry is submitted. The applicant must already have the scanned photo file when they submit the entry on-line. The photo cannot be submitted separate from the online application. Only one on-line entry by or for each person can be submitted. Multiple submissions will disqualify the entry for that person for DV-2006. The entire entry (photo and application together) can be submitted electronically from the United States.

26. CAN I SAVE THE FORM ON-LINE SO THAT I CAN FILL OUT PART AND THEN COME BACK LATER AND COMPLETE THE REMAINDER?

No, this cannot be done. The E-DV Entry Form is designed to be completed and submitted at one time. However, because the form is in two parts, and because of possible network interruptions and delays, the E-DV system is designed to handle up to sixty (60) minutes between downloading of the form and when the entry is received at the E-DV web site after being submitted online. If more than sixty minutes elapses, and the entry has not been electronically received, the information received so far is discarded. This is done so that there is no possibility that a full entry could accidentally be interpreted as a duplicate of a previous partial entry. For example, suppose an applicant with a wife and child sends a filled in E-DV Entry Form Part One and then receives Form Part Two, but there is a delay before sending Part Two because of trouble finding the file which holds the child's photograph. If the filled in Form Part Two is sent by the applicant and received by the E-DV website within sixty (60) minutes then there is no problem, but if the Form Part Two is received after sixty (60) minutes has elapsed then the applicant will be informed that they need to start over for the entire entry. The DV-2006 instructions explain clearly and completely what information needs to be gathered to fill in the form. This way you can be fully prepared, making sure you have all of the information needed, before you start to complete the form on-line.

27. IF THE SUBMITTED DIGITAL IMAGES DO NOT CONFORM TO THE SPECIFICATIONS, THE PROCEDURES STATE THAT THE SYSTEM WILL AUTOMATICALLY REJECT THE E-DV ENTRY FORM AND NOTIFY THE SENDER. DOES THIS MEAN I WILL BE ABLE RE-SUBMIT MY ENTRY?

Yes, the entry can be resubmitted. Since the entry was automatically rejected it was not actually considered as submitted to the E-DV website. It does not count as a submitted E-DV entry, and no confirmation notice of receipt is sent. If there are problems with the digital photograph sent because it does not conform to the requirements, it is automatically rejected by the E-DV website. However, the amount of time it takes the rejection message to reach the sender is unpredictable due to the nature of the Internet. If the problems can be fixed by the applicant, and the Form Part One or Two re-sent within sixty (60) minutes then there is no problem. Otherwise the submission process will have to be started over. An applicant can try to submit an application as many times as is necessary until a complete application is received and the confirmation notice sent.

28. WILL THE ELECTRONIC CONFIRMATION NOTICE THAT THE COMPLETED E-DV ENTRY FORM HAS BEEN RECEIVED THROUGH THE ONLINE SYSTEM BE SENT IMMEDIATELY AFTER SUBMISSION?

The response from the E-DV website which contains confirmation of the receipt of an acceptable E-DV Entry Form is sent by the E-DV website immediately, but how long it takes the response to reach the sender is unpredictable due to the nature of the Internet. If many minutes have elapsed since pressing the 'Submit' button there is no harm in pressing the 'Submit' button a second time. The E-DV system will not be confused by a situation where the 'Submit' button is hit a second time because no confirmation response has been received. An applicant can try to submit an application as many times as is necessary until a complete application is received and the confirmation notice sent.

LIST OF COUNTRIES BY REGION WHOSE NATIVES QUALIFY

The lists below show the countries whose natives are QUALIFIED within each geographic region for this diversity program. The determination of countries within each region is based on information provided by the Geographer of the Department of State. The countries whose natives do not qualify for the DV-2006 program were identified by the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) according to the formula in Section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Dependent areas overseas are included within the region of the governing country. The countries whose natives do NOT qualify for this diversity program (because they are the principal source countries of Family-Sponsored and Employment-Based immigration, or "high admission" countries) are noted after the respective regional lists.

AFRICA
 Algeria
 Angola
 Benin
 Botswana
 Burkina Faso
 Burundi
 Cameroon
 Cape Verde
 Central African Republic
 Chad
 Comoros
 Congo
 Congo, Democratic Republic of the
 Cote D'Ivoire (Ivory Coast)
 Djibouti
 Egypt
 Equatorial Guinea
 Eritrea
 Ethiopia
 Gabon
 Gambia, The
 Ghana
 Guinea
 Guinea-Bissau
 Kenya
 Lesotho
 Liberia
 Libya
 Madagascar
 Malawi
 Mali
 Mauritania
 Mauritius
 Morocco
 Mozambique
 Namibia
 Niger
 Nigeria
 Rwanda
 Sao Tome and Principe
 Senegal
 Seychelles
 Sierra Leone
 Somalia
 South Africa
 Sudan
 Swaziland
 Tanzania
 Togo
 Tunisia
 Uganda
 Zambia
 Zimbabwe

ASIA
 Afghanistan
 Bahrain
 Bangladesh
 Bhutan
 Brunei
 Burma
 Cambodia
 East Timor
 Hong Kong Special Administrative Region
 Indonesia
 Iran
 Iraq
 Israel
 Japan
 Jordan
 Kuwait
 Laos
 Lebanon
 Malaysia
 Maldives
 Mongolia
 Nepal
 North Korea
 Oman
 Qatar
 Saudi Arabia
 Singapore
 Sri Lanka
 Syria
 Taiwan
 Thailand
 United Arab Emirates
 Yemen

Natives of the following Asian countries do not qualify for this year's diversity program:

China [mainland-born], India, Pakistan, South Korea, Philippines, and Vietnam. The Hong Kong S.A.R. and Taiwan do qualify and are listed above. Macau S.A.R. also qualifies and is listed below.

EUROPE

Albania
 Andorra
 Armenia
 Austria
 Azerbaijan
 Belarus
 Belgium
 Bosnia and Herzegovina
 Bulgaria

Croatia
 Cyprus
 Czech Republic
 Denmark (including components and dependent areas overseas)
 Estonia
 Finland
 France (including components and dependent areas overseas)
 Georgia
 Germany
 Greece
 Hungary
 Iceland
 Ireland
 Italy
 Kazakhstan
 Kyrgyzstan
 Latvia
 Liechtenstein
 Lithuania
 Luxembourg
 Macau Special Administrative Region
 Macedonia, the Former Yugoslav Republic
 Malta
 Moldova
 Monaco
 Netherlands (including components and dependent areas overseas)
 Northern Ireland
 Norway
 Poland
 Portugal (including components and dependent areas overseas)
 Romania
 San Marino
 Serbia and Montenegro
 Slovakia
 Slovenia
 Spain
 Sweden
 Switzerland
 Tajikistan
 Turkey
 Turkmenistan
 Ukraine
 Uzbekistan
 Vatican City

Natives of the following European countries do not qualify for this year's diversity program: Great Britain and Russia. Great Britain (United Kingdom) includes the following dependent areas: Anguilla, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands, Gibraltar, Montserrat,

Pitcairn, St. Helena, Turks and Caicos Islands. Note that for purposes of the diversity program only, Northern Ireland is treated separately; Northern Ireland does qualify and is listed among the qualifying areas.

NORTH AMERICA

The Bahamas

In North America, natives of Canada and Mexico do not qualify for this year's diversity program.

OCEANIA

Australia (including components and dependent areas overseas)

Fiji

Kiribati

Marshall Islands

Micronesia, Federated States of

Nauru

New Zealand (including components and dependent areas overseas)

Palau

Papua New Guinea

Solomon Islands

Tonga

Tuvalu

Vanuatu

Samoa

SOUTH AMERICA, CENTRAL AMERICA, AND THE CARIBBEAN

Antigua and Barbuda

Argentina

Barbados

Belize

Bolivia

Brazil

Chile

Costa Rica

Cuba

Dominica

Ecuador

Grenada

Guatemala

Guyana

Honduras

Nicaragua

Panama

Paraguay

Peru

Saint Kitts and Nevis

Saint Lucia

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

Suriname

Trinidad and Tobago

Uruguay

Venezuela

Countries in this region whose natives do not qualify for this year's diversity program:

Colombia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Haiti, Jamaica, and Mexico.

Released on September 29, 2004

(Preceding items distributed by the Bureau of International Information Programs, U.S. Department of State. Web site: <http://usinfo.state.gov>)